

C.) REMARKS

This Response is filed in reply to the (Non-Final) Office Action dated March 13, 2008.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner:

- (1) rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 21, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Janach *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,204);
- (2) rejected Claims 3-5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janach *et al.*;
- (3) objected to Claims 7-10 and 25-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that such Claims each would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and
- (4) allowed Claims 11-20.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. Upon entry of this Response, Claims 1-5, 8-23, and 26-28 will be pending for purposes of examination. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Applicants' Response to the §102(b) Rejection of Claim 1

Applicants have amended Claim 1 in a manner believed to overcome the §102(b) rejection made on the basis of Janach *et al.* Specifically, Applicants have amended Claim 1 by incorporating therein the limitations present in each of dependent Claims 6 and 7 (both now canceled). No new matter has been introduced by these amendments to Claim 1. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 7 contains allowable subject matter. As the limitations present in Claim 7, including the limitations present in intervening Claim 6, have been added to (base) Claim 1, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claim 1, and submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants' Response to the §102(b) Rejection of Claims 2 and 6

Claim 2 depends directly on Claim 1 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 1, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, Claim 2 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claim 2, and submit that Claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of Claim 6, Applicants note that Claim 6 has been canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection thereagainst moot.

Applicants' Response to the §103(a) Rejection of Claims 3-5

Each of Claims 3-5 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 1 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 1, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, each of Claims 3-5 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 3-5, and submit that Claims 3-5 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants' Response to the Objection to Claims 7-10

Each of Claims 8-10 depends directly on Claim 1 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 1, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, each of Claims 8-10 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art, especially as the Examiner has indicated that Claims 8-10 each contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claims 8-10, and submit that Claims 8-10 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding the objection insofar as it relates to Claim 7, Applicants note that Claim 7 has been canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection thereagainst moot.

Applicants' Response to the Rejection of Claim 21

Applicants have amended Claim 21 in a manner believed to overcome the §102(b) rejection made on the basis of Janach *et al.* Specifically, Applicants have amended Claim 21 by incorporating therein the limitations present in each of dependent Claims 24 and 25 (both now canceled). No new matter has been introduced by these amendments to Claim 21. The Examiner has indicated that Claim 25 contains allowable subject matter. As the limitations present in Claim 25, including the limitations present in intervening Claim 24, have been added

to (base) Claim 21, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claim 21, and submit that Claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants' Response to the §102(b) Rejection of Claims 22 and 24

Claim 22 depends directly on Claim 21 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 21, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, Claim 22 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claim 22, and submit that Claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of Claim 24, Applicants note that Claim 24 has been canceled herein.

Applicants' Response to the §103(a) Rejection of Claim 23

Claim 23 depends directly on Claim 21 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 21, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, Claim 23 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 23, and submit that Claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants' Response to the Objection to Claims 25-28

Each of Claims 26-28 depends directly or indirectly on Claim 21 and is believed to be allowable by reason of its dependency on Claim 21, which in turn is believed to be allowable for the reasons provided above. Additionally, each of Claims 26-28 recites further limitations that distinguish over the applied art, especially as the Examiner has indicated that Claims 26-28 each contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claims 26-28, and submit that Claims 26-28 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding the objection insofar as it relates to Claim 25, Applicants note that Claim 25 has been canceled herein.

Amendment to Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to correct a typographical error concerning its dependency.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application. On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5, 8-23, and 26-28 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution of this Application could be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative.

It is believed that no fees are due with the filing of this Paper. If Applicants are mistaken in their belief, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Respectfully submitted,

MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK

/Peter Anthopolos/

By

Peter Anthopolos
Reg. No. 60,620
100 Pine Street, P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
Tel: (717) 237-5458
Fax: (717) 260-1776

Dated: July 11, 2008